

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KHOT PANYANOUVONG,

Petitioner,

v.

PEOPLES,

Respondent.

Case No. 2:25-cv-1128-WBS-JDP (P)

ORDER

Petitioner filed a section 2254 petition, and, after I gave him multiple opportunities to amend, I recommended that it be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable federal habeas claim. ECF No. 14. Those recommendations were adopted by the district judge, ECF No. 17, and petitioner has a pending appeal with the Court of Appeals, ECF Nos. 27 & 29. He has also, however, filed several motions that I will, in light of the pending appeal, deny.

First, petitioner has filed a “petition to modify fine,” ECF No. 20, wherein, on a California state court form, he seeks modification of a fine that was imposed for traffic and vehicle code violations. Such fines and whether to modify them are the prerogative of the state courts. The motion is, therefore, denied.

Second, petitioner has filed a motion for extension of time, but does not state what he is

1 seeking additional time to do. ECF No. 22. The motion is, therefore, denied without prejudice.
2 Petitioner is advised that this case is closed and there are no pending deadlines imposed by this
3 court. If he seeks additional time for some filing related to his pending appeal, such a motion for
4 extension must be filed with the Ninth Circuit. For this same reason, petitioner's motion for
5 extension of time to amend petition, ECF No. 30, is also denied.

6 Third, petitioner has filed an application for a certificate of appealability. ECF No. 23.
7 The district judge has already declined to issue a certificate of appealability, ECF No. 17, and
8 petitioner has not raised any substantive argument as to why that decision should be reversed.
9 This application is, therefore, denied.


10 Fourth, petitioner has filed a "petition for review," ECF No. 24, addressed to the
11 California Supreme Court. For obvious reasons, this court will decline to rule on this matter that
12 appears misfiled. It is denied.

13 Conclusion

14 Accordingly, it is ORDERED that petitioner's filings, ECF Nos. 20, 22, 23, 24, & 30, are
15 DENIED.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: September 24, 2025

19 
20 JEREMY D. PETERSON
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28